

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-25 are pending.

Claims 1 and 10 are amended to incorporate limitations of claims 8-9 and 15-16, respectively. Claims 8-9 and 15-16 are accordingly canceled.

Claims 1 and 10 are further amended to incorporate a technical feature of “the elastic locking member comprising an upward-facing sliding surface and a downward-facing sliding surface; when the pressing force is acting on either the upward-facing sliding surface or the downward-facing sliding surface, the pressing force will urge the elastic locking member into the insert legs; when the pressing force is removed, the elastic locking member will restore to its original position on the outside of the insert legs by means of an elastic restoration force from an elastic force”, which is disclosed in page 7, lines 1-7, of the specification. No new matter is introduced.

In addition, claim 17 is amended to also incorporate the limitations of claims 8 and 9 and the above technical feature.

The rejection of claims 1-4 as obvious over Chen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,912,122) in view of Armitage et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,282,082) is respectfully traversed. “To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.” *In re Royka*, 490 F. 2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974); MPEP § 2143.03. In the present case, the prior art does not meet this standard.

The present invention relates to a modularized, electronic device coupling architecture and method. The architecture comprises a rotation mechanism, a pivot mechanism, at least one insert leg and an engaging mechanism having an elastic locking member and a lock hole structure. As shown in FIG. 5 and recited in page 7, lines 1-7, of the specification, the elastic locking member 141 comprises an upward-facing sliding surface 143a and a downward-facing sliding surface 143b. Therefore, when the engaging mechanism 140 is moving downward and going to be inserted into the engaging hole 131, a contact force due to the contact between the downward-facing sliding surface 143b and an upper right edge of the engaging hole will act on the downward-facing sliding surface 143b to urge the elastic locking member 141 into the insert legs 130 and to be engaged with the locking hole 142 eventually; on the other hand, when the engaging mechanism 140 is moving upward and to be detached from the engaging hole 131, another contact force due to the contact between the upward-facing sliding surface 143a and a downward-facing surface of the locking hole 142 will act on the upward-facing sliding surface 143a to urge the elastic locking member 141 into the insert legs 130 again, such that the elastic locking member 141 can be detached from the locking hole 142.

According to the Office Action, Chen et al. teaches an engaging mechanism that includes an elastic locking member 128 and a locking hole 127. As shown in FIGS. 1A-1C and 2 and recited in col. 3, line 44 to col. 4, line 39, by Chen et al., the elastic locking member 128 passes through the fixing holes 127 for fixing the second rotational device 124 so that the display 110 can work stably. When the display 110 arrives at 0 or 180 degrees, the elastic locking member 128 rebounds to the rebound position via a spring force. However, Chen et al. fails to disclose

that the elastic locking member 128 comprises an upward-facing sliding surface and a downward-facing sliding surface, along which the elastic locking member 128 can slide itself into the locking hole 127, since the elastic locking member 128 is engaged with the locking hole 127 by passing itself through the locking hole 127.

As for Armitage et al., this reference discusses a case for a modular tablet computer system, but does not teach an engaging mechanism having an elastic locking member and a lock hole structure, or an elastic locking member having an upward-facing sliding surface and a downward-facing sliding surface.

The combination of Chen et al. and Armitage et al. fails to teach or suggest all limitations of claims 1-4 as amended. Accordingly, claims 1-4 are not obvious.

The rejection of claims 5-7, 10-14, and 17-25 as obvious over Chen et al. and Armitage et al., and further in view of Helot et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,437,973) is respectfully traversed. As pointed out above, neither Chen et al. nor Armitage et al. teach or suggest an elastic locking member having upward-facing sliding surface and a downward-facing sliding surface, or an engaging mechanism having an elastic locking member and a lock hole structure, as called for in amended claims 5-7, 10-14, and 17-25.

Similarly, Helot et al. fails to teach these claim limitations. Helot et al. discloses a modular mechanism for a movable display but does not teach an engaging mechanism having an elastic locking member and a lock hole structure, or an elastic locking member having an upward-facing sliding surface and a downward-facing sliding surface.

The combination of Chen et al., Armitage et al., and Helot et al. fails to teach or suggest all limitations of amended claims 5-7, 10-14, and 17-25. Accordingly, claims 5-7, 10-14, and 17-25 are not obvious.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

No fee is believed due. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be required with this paper or to credit any overpayment of fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0337. If an extension of time is required in connection with this paper, please consider this a Petition therefor and charge any fees required to Deposit Account No. 50-0337.

Dated: June 7, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



Miles Yamanaka  
Reg. No. 45,665

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P  
555 South Flower Street, 41<sup>st</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90071 •  
(213) 892-9200 – Tel. / (213) 892-9494 – Fax